

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Again, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an indication that the Examiner has considered the three foreign patent documents cited by Applicants in an information disclosure statement. A copy of the information disclosure statement, which appears in PAIR, is attached for the Examiner's convenience.

Claim 1 has been amended in response to the Section 112 rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the cooling fluid is also the first and second fluid. Applicants believe that the amendment of claim 1 also addresses the other issue raised by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the prior art rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has also been amended to make clear that the control valve is selectively actuated by a first impulse and by a second impulse. The control valve connects the working chamber to the first source of cooling fluid in response to receipt of the first impulse, and the control valve connects the working chamber to the second source of cooling fluid in response to receipt of the second impulse. Cho does not do this.

Cho connects the brake booster to a source of fluid at only one pressure. Cho does not selectively and alternatively connect the booster to sources of fluid at two different pressures.

Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-10 are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/david r. price/

David R. Price
Reg. No. 31,557

Docket No.: 022896-2041
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560